APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/364,370	07/30/1999	TOM THUAN CHEUNG	ST9-99-077/P70-42971	9357

23373	7590	05/16/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER
HO, ANDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/364,370	CHEUNG, TOM THUAN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andy Ho	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 February 2006</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6)☐ Other: .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 2/28/2006.

2. Claims 1-31 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee

set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

2/28/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Jacobs U.S Patent No. 6,710,786.

As to claim 1, Jacobs teaches a method of producing an output object (URL with state information, lines 3-12 column 3), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving an input object (352, Fig. 3A), wherein the received input object contains input data and one input function (...client submits a request relating to the same operation, the client sends the URL that was previously provided by the server which contains the state information include the identity of the client, the ID and status of the operation, what has already transpired in the operation, and any other context information associated with the operation..., lines 3-18 column 3;...a browser request in the form of a Uniform Resource Locator. The browser request serves as an identifier for a web object, for example an HTML page or an operation to be performed..., lines 63-67 column 8;...the revised browser request may include, for example, a context object that contains data required for the proper operation of the cartridge. The data required for proper operation of a cartridge may include, for example, a transaction ID that identifies a transaction with which the browser request is associated..., lines 19-25 column 9) executable on a computer (280, Fig. 2);

determining a type of the received input object (determine request object type 354, Fig. 3A);

based on the determined type (does request object type match with a cartridge 356, Fig. 3A), ascertaining whether the received input object satisfies one or more predefined requirements (...if the request object type corresponds to a cartridge, the virtual path manager also indicates to the dispatcher 214 whether authentication is required..., lines 48-51 column 16); and

when it is ascertained that the received input object satisfies each predefined

requirement, executing the input function on the computer (executes the request, line 4

column 18),

wherein the input function comprises computer-implemented programming

instructions (request for operation to be executed, lines 52-63 column 2).

As to claim 2, Jacobs further teaches ascertaining whether the received input

object satisfies one or more predefined requirements by executing one or more

verification functions (...the authenticate() routine validates whether the client

requesting the services of the cartridge is authorized to use those services..., lines 20-

22 column 8).

As to claim 3, Jacobs further teaches a source code for each verification

function is located in a predefined section of a controller object source code (the revised

browser request may include, for example, a context object that contains data required

for the proper operation of the cartridge. The data required for proper operation of a

cartridge may include, for example, a transaction ID that identifies a transaction with

which the browser request is associated..., lines 19-25 column 9).

As to claim 4, Jacobs further teaches producing an output object by using a

result produced by the executed input function (...after the second request is

processed, the server updates the state information associated with the operation, and

incorporates the updated state information into another URL. This URL, along with the

response to the second request, is sent back to the client to be maintained by the

client..., lines 22-27 column 3).

As to claim 5, Jacobs further teaches the received input object is received from an application (client browser 202, Fig. 2), and wherein the method further comprises the step of returning the output object to the application (...along with the response to the second request, is sent back to the client to be maintained by the client..., lines 22-27 column 3).

As to claim 6, Jacobs further teaches the received input object is received from a user (user of the browser, lines 31-32 column 1) and wherein the method further comprises the step of returning the output object to the user (...along with the response to the second request, is sent back to the client to be maintained by the client..., lines 22-27 column 3).

As to claim 7, Jacobs further teaches receiving a plurality of input objects (multiple request operations, lines 52-55 column 2), wherein each received input object contains an input function, and wherein each input function has a predefined signature (each request contains a unique state information, lines 3-30 column 3).

As to claim 8, Jacobs further teaches regulating a flow of received input objects (the virtual path manager also indicates to the dispatcher 214 whether authentication is required..., lines 48-51 column 16).

As to claim 9, Jacobs further teaches storing some of the received input objects in a queue (...resource manager 254 maintains a queue of the requests that cannot be immediately serviced. When it becomes possible to service a queued request, the request is removed from the queue and processed..., lines 23-28 column 14).

As to claims 11-19, they are apparatus claims of claims 1-9, respectively.

Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-9 above.

As to claims 21-29, they are computer product claims of claims 1-9,

respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-3 above.

As to claim 31, Jacobs further teaches the input function comprises instructions

in a mark-up language (Hypertext Markup Language, line 24 column 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10, 20 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Jacobs in view of Nakai U.S Patent No. 6,253,248.

As to claim 10, Jacobs does not explicitly teach returning the object and

requesting to resend the object. Nakai teaches returning the object (the request fails,

lines 30-43 column 13); requesting the sender (requests the client 107, line 40 column

13) to re-send (to resend the request, line 41 column 13) at a later time (1213, Fig. 14).

It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Nakai to the system of Jacobs

because if there is a failure in the transaction, the client has to resend the request to the

server as disclosed by Nakai (lines 30-44 column 13).

As to claim 20, it is an apparatus claim of claim 10. Therefore, it is rejected for

the same reason as claim 10 above.

As to claim 30, it is a computer product claim of claim 10. Therefore, it is

rejected for the same reason as claim 10 above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Jacobs reference does not teach the input function

comprises computer-implemented programming instructions (Remarks, second

paragraph page 8). In response, the applicant argued a new limitation that was not

claimed before. However, this new limitation is still met by the cited reference as

disclosed in the claim rejections above. More specifically, the applicant claims the input

function comprises computer-implemented programming instructions; however, the

applicant does not provide any further detail regarding these programming instructions.

As broadly claimed, these programming instructions can be interpreted as programming

executable instructions or operations to be performed by a programming entity. Jacobs

teaches executing client's request for operation (lines 52-63 column 2), as disclosed in

the claim rejections above. The reference meets the limitation as claimed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIM) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or' Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.

- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.

- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 – 3762

A.H
May 15, 2006